

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VII

NEW YORK, MARCH 7, 1914

No. 18

In the last number of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* appeared an interesting account of the efforts which, for some months past, have been put forth for the purpose of organizing, for Philadelphia and its vicinity, an association whose object shall be the promotion of liberal studies in general, and the support of the Classics in particular. For eighteen years The Classical Club of Philadelphia, founded by Professor Alfred Gudeman, then at the University of Pennsylvania, has had vigorous life. An interesting account of its one hundredth meeting was published in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5,134-135. But this Club has been an association for men only. The papers delivered before it have seldom, if ever, been pedagogical in character. The speakers, furthermore, have taken the value of the Classics for granted, and have discussed matters which might seem to many more or less esoteric.

The Club is even larger and more vigorous at present than in the past; it looks forward to a long and, it hopes, to an even more prosperous future. The plans at present under way call for another Association much wider in its appeal, which shall unite men and women both, and shall include within its membership as many persons as possible who are not professionally interested in the Classics—men and women both who, though they do not teach the Classics and perhaps do not even read the Classics any longer, are nevertheless convinced that they profited themselves by study of the Classics, and are also convinced that an education which leaves the Classics out of consideration is but a maimed and halt thing. It is difficult enough to establish and to maintain a Classical Association among those whose primary interest in the Classics may be described as a professional—a bread and butter—interest. It has been a very difficult undertaking to formulate plans for an Association such as the one under discussion, for the interests of several prospective classes of members, of widely divergent points of view, had to be considered. But the task has been faced cheerfully, and I am confident that the new Association, which is to be launched on Saturday, March 14 (for the programme see below, p. 144), will be successful. Let us all give to it our best wishes, and, if it ever falls within our power, substantial help.

The grounds on which such an Association may

make its appeal to lovers of the Classics and of liberal studies in general were set forth cogently in the communication printed in the last issue, to which reference has already been made. The claims of the Classics can best be presented by organized effort: to the cry of the individual little heed will be given, however loud and forceful that individual cry may be. Isolation is the worst foe of the teacher of the Classics, at any rate. The teacher who sees no new classical books, who attends no classical meetings, who belongs to no classical Association, who meets no other classical teachers, who reads no classical periodical is foreordained and predestined to progressive degeneration as a teacher. In this connection there is a curious phenomenon. Relatively, the teachers in small towns throughout the country are far more eager to avail themselves of the opportunities afforded by Classical Associations than are the teachers in the larger cities. In New York City, for example, there are many teachers of the Classics who are deaf to every appeal to them to join a Classical Association, and so help the cause in whose ranks, nominally at least, they are enlisted and, while helping others, receive help by contact with fellowworkers in that cause. Making all allowances for those who, unknown to their fellows, are carrying some heavy financial burden, there are many who are to all appearances indifferent to any and all opportunities for self-improvement in their profession. I wonder if the fact that teachers in the school system of a great city are virtually irremovable, however incompetent or indifferent they may be, and the further fact that the salaries obtainable in such systems are good (in many cases far better than those available to classical teachers in the Colleges) have anything to do with the sort of indifference of which I am now writing. Let us hope that in Philadelphia and its neighborhood there will be few, if any, teachers who will not eagerly avail themselves of the opportunities afforded by the new Classical Association, few who will starve themselves by failure to bring themselves within reach of fresh influences, stimulating, broadening, and deepening. One other point is pertinent here: how can we expect those not professionally interested in the Classics to organize in their behalf if we ourselves refuse to combine?

The Classical Association of the Atlantic States can be of profit to the new Association and in return can receive substantial benefit from it. On the one hand The Classical Association of the Atlantic States can offer to the new Association a ready means of communicating with its members, if they become members also of the larger body, and a depository for such of the papers presented at its meetings as have a wider appeal or are well worthy of preservation in printed form. The members of the new Association, if they become members also of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States and so receive *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, will have in the paper an outward and visible sign of their membership in a great body, devoted in common to a cause of lofty character and high value. Not all members can attend all meetings, even of a local body, but all can find time, if they will, to read a paper which comes to them at short intervals, giving news relating to the cause they have at heart, presenting fresh points of view regarding familiar things, bringing forward new matters, touching questions of the material available for the successful prosecution of work as well as proper methods of work, and indicating, as far as possible, the new books appearing within the classical field, and giving some indication of their value. The new Association can add materially to the membership of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States and so to the clientele of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*.

Once more, then, I give to those who have worked so hard and so long for the formation of this new Association best wishes for success, and I urge all those to whom it appeals for support to grant it this support, at once, without reservation. C. K.

PAUSANIAS AS AN HISTORIAN¹

The periegesis of Pausanias is regarded in two lights: first, as a description of the monuments of Greece, of inestimable value to the archaeologist; secondly, as a repository of myths, legends, love stories, tales of notable natural phenomena, and numerous facts of history, given either in the form of brief notes, or in extensive introductions and excursuses. Pausanias himself recognized these two aspects of his work as *θεσφήματα* and *λόγοι*. Robert, in his book *Pausanias als Schriftsteller* (1909), has emphasized the importance of the *λόγοι* which, he thinks, are usually skipped, but constituted, in the judgment of Pausanias, the chief merit of his work, whereas the monuments furnished merely a framework for the literature. For an archaeologist's estimate of Robert's view, see Professor David Robinson's valuable review in *American Journal of Philology* 31.213 ff. The problem has

been to a large extent to establish the relationship Pausanias holds to what is known as periegetical literature. This had its beginnings in the local histories of Ionia: year-books, chronicles, genealogies, and stories of the founding of cities. Charon of Lampsacus, the Lesbian Hellanicus and, especially, Hecataeus may be mentioned. Out of the efforts of these writers rose the work of the 'father of history', Herodotus, who reflects his predecessors in a marked degree; but the higher forms of history did not put an end to the local histories, which continued to flourish, and became especially common in the Hellenistic period. In a recent number of *Hermes* (48.194 ff.), Georgi Pasquali has discussed interestingly the extant periegetical literature of the Hellenistic age, which has lately been enriched by the discovery of a papyrus from Hawara, published by Wilcken. He traces a connection with the above mentioned Ionic literature, and shows a close correspondence with the periegesis of Pausanias. The points of resemblance between the latter and Herodotus are not due solely to Pausanias's direct dependence on Herodotus, but also to the department of literature. But Pasquali censures Pausanias for exceeding the limits of the traditional form of periegetical literature. We must, however, recognize that Pausanias was justified in taking a more comprehensive view of his subject, feeling, as he did, the need of supplying historical information to readers of his own time, the period of the Antonines. Accordingly, more than a fourth of his work is devoted to history. In undertaking to throw some light on his treatment of this, I hope to show that the scattered parts are largely held together by a plan.

Pausanias's periegesis, with its introductions, notes and digressions, gives the reader a survey of Greek history from the earliest mythological period down to the Roman conquest, and glimpses even of later days, to the times of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. How well Pausanias, if we include his brief allusions, covers the field of Greek history, may be seen by a comparison of his work with Peter's chronological tables, which, together with Abbott's *Skeleton Outline of Greek History*, containing genealogical tables, is serviceable in systematizing the scattered historical accounts, attached as these are to the monuments, cities and countries visited. In this way we can see that a plan of history runs through the whole work. Pausanias himself had the needs of his readers in mind. Many articles (and not merely the historical ones) are complete in themselves and might seem to have been intended for an encyclopedia, and it is interesting to find that about twenty reappear in Suidas, and that nearly everyone is almost literally transcribed. Numerous cross-references facilitate the task of correlating the dismem-

¹This paper was read at the Seventh Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Baltimore, May 3, 1913.

bered parts and chronological sequence is shown by means of genealogies, chronological tables, an occasional Olympiad, and particularly by the use, as chronological points, of memorable wars and battles, which he could assume to be familiar, or which appear in connected accounts. While there was a certain antagonism between his historical and his periegetical plans, both were united in his aim to connect the past with the present. Thus the histories of Mantinea, Elatea and Thebes compare fairly well with the sketches of those places given in Baedeker, where also memorable wars are the chief links that connect the past with the present. But, whereas the frequent phrases *ἐς ἐπὶ*, *κατ' ἐπὶ* and the like were called forth (really or ostensibly) by the existing monuments and ruins, the Roman conquest was conveniently made the goal of his general scheme of history, which is revealed when we correlate the various introductions and digressions with the history of the Achaeans in Book 7, particularly with the sections dealing with the revival of the Achaean League, coincident with the invasion of the Gauls in 279-278 B.C. When Pausanias reaches this point (7.6.8), he does not really tell of a revival of the League, as Polybius does (2.40.5-6). He describes rather the general political situation in Greece, which favored the expansion of Achaean power: Sparta had been humbled at Leuctra and was held in check by Megalopolis and Messene; Thebes had suffered so greatly at the hands of Alexander that, even after the restoration by Cassander, the Thebans were unable to hold their own (i.e. against Sulla; cf. 9.7.4-5); and, while Athens enjoyed the good will of Greece, owing to her later deeds (cf. the Lamian war, and the prominence of Athens—according to Pausanias—in repelling the Gauls), she was engaged in constant warfare with Macedonia. Further, while the alliances of the other Greek cities were no longer existent, the Achaeans had a common council to direct their affairs and moreover had not suffered from war and pestilence (!), as much as had the rest of the Greeks (7.6.3 ff.), and had remained free of tyrants (! cf. Polybius 2.41.10), except Pellene. While this summary of Greek history explains the rapid expansion of the League, which began when Aratus freed the Sicyonians of their tyrant, it also shows us that the period of Greek history that he had particularly elected to treat Pausanias viewed from the standpoint of his Achaean history, which constituted the last chapter leading to the Roman conquest. All this and more will appear in the detailed exposition of the several books.

The Attica has no introduction, mythical or historical. All mythological and historical matter is introduced in periegetical notes and digressions; and, as the latter are largely concerned with the

Hellenistic history of Egypt, etc., not directly affecting Athens, they seem to occupy space that should better have been devoted to the description of monuments. Gurlitt (*Über Pausanias* [1890], 2-3) shows that the Attica appeared first as a separate publication, and points out an improvement in the style and composition of the later books, made possible by the employment of introductions. Robert (*Pausanias als Schriftsteller*) has a different view of successive publications and sees no improvement in style (cf. *Amer. Journ. Phil.* 31. 216). The more liberal treatment later of the monuments is indeed apparent; but in the matter of introductions and digressions, especially the historical ones, there is no steady progression. Books 3, 4, and 7 have long introductions and few or no digressions, presenting a striking contrast with Books 2, 5(6), 8, 9, and 10, especially with the last three, which have brief historical introductions and long digressions, the longest (in 10.19.5 ff.) filling over sixteen pages. The fact is that each of the ten books has its individuality. The Attica, without a formal introduction, awakens interest at the start. Even a condensed introductory outline of Attic history would have tended to become a general sketch of Greek history, which he preferred to give, in a fashion, in Book 3, as we shall see; besides, he desired to reserve space for his Hellenistic history. Hence he chose to give all of his historical matter in the Attica in the form of digressions. Further, the wealth of literary, as well as of monumental material, caused him to decide at the outset to give only selections of *λόγοι* and *θεωρήματα* (cf. 1.39.3); and he was relieved of the duty of giving any formal exposition of Athenian history down to the battle of Chaeronea by assuming a general knowledge of it in his readers, especially through a familiarity with Herodotus and Thucydides. While he could thus, in 1.8.5, pass by the familiar story of Harmodius and Aristogiton with the remark *ἐρέπουσιν ἐστὶν εἰρημύνα*, the above assumption did not prevent him from using these historians, especially Herodotus, and it lent zest to anecdotes, or other matter, that they do not give, as the story of *Δεῖνα* in 1.23.2. In view of the attitude outlined above toward the earlier Athenian history, it is interesting to see how skillfully he manages to give a survey of that history in his enumeration of the monuments in the 'national cemetery' along the road to the Academy (1.25.2 ff.). A close examination of this seemingly bare outline shows that it was carefully constructed and presents a kind of prototype of later outlines of wars and battles, which begin in 5.4.7.

Gurlitt (*Über Pausanias*, 6 ff.) shows that already in the Attica there is an artificial topographical plan; further, from the condensed form of the digressions he inferred some historical plan

(5). The latter was also assumed by O. Müller (cf. Götting. Gelehrte Anzeig. [1824], p. 1912). We shall see that Pausanias was indeed working out an historical scheme from the beginning, and it is obvious that, in making the Roman conquest the goal of this scheme and, hence, the history of the Achaean League its nucleus, he was forced to let this historical scheme take precedence, to a certain extent, over the periegetical plan of making his selections of monuments according to a chosen topographical order; and, no doubt, he was thus prompted, at times, to slight important works of art and to seek occasions for introducing his Hellenistic material. This antagonism between the periegetical and the historical plans is more perceptible in the Attica than elsewhere. As Athens, having played only a minor part in the conflict with Rome, had been the center of the struggles between the Diadochi, Book 1 offered the most suitable place for a general account of the Hellenistic period, which justified, in a measure, digressions that treat more or less fully, or, at least, touch, the affairs of Sicily, Italy, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, Asia, Syria, Egypt and Cyrene. The very first note (1.1.1) concerns the small barren island named after Patroclus, the naval commander of Ptolemy II, who sent a fleet to the assistance of the Athenians in the Chrimonidean war, which is more fully treated in 3.6.4 ff. He thus introduces at the beginning the matter of Athens's warfare with Macedonia. We should have expected the more important island Helene to be introduced here (cf. 1.35.1). Probably other selections, which in themselves seem more justifiable, were similarly determined. Leosthenes and the Lamian War (1.3 and 1.25.4-5) receive fuller consideration than Conon and the battle of Cnidus (cf. 1.1.3; 2.2; 3.2). In 1.3.4 Pausanias alludes indirectly to the period with which he begins his account of the revival of the Achaean League (cf. 7.6.8), for in discussing the portraits of Xenophon's son Gryllus and Epaminondas, in a painting of the battle of Mantinea, he tells us that Xenophon wrote of the whole war: the seizure of the Cadmea, the defeat of the Lacedaemonians at Leuctra, the Boeotian invasion of the Peloponnesus and the alliance of the Athenians with the Lacedaemonians (Hellenica V-VII). Then in 1.4.1 ff. he devotes about three pages to the Gallic invasion of Greece and Asia, ostensibly to elucidate a portrait of Calippus in the *βουλευτήριον*, but really to familiarize the reader at the outset with an event that was to be used as a chronological point of reference. In 10.19.5 ff. he gives a detailed account of the Gallic invasion of Europe (the crossing of the Gauls into Asia is merely mentioned), which, he says, he intended to give in connection with Delphi, the scene of the greatest conflict of Greeks with the barbarians. This was therefore not an after-thought, as some suppose, and the sketch of the Gauls

in the Attica with its discussion of their country and names was evidently planned to serve as an introduction. Soon after, in 1.5.5, following an account of the ten eponymi of the Clisthenean phylae, omitted by Herodotus, he continues: *ἕτερον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶνδε φυλὰς ἔχουσι Ἀττάλου τοῦ Μυσοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου καὶ κατ' ἐμὲ ἦδη βασιλέως Ἀδριανοῦ κτλ.* These names are important in the architectural history of Athens; but he is not interested in that here, aside from a few generalities included in his eulogistic note on Hadrian (probably from an inscription), who is briefly treated just as, later, Attalus is curtly dismissed with a reference to his account of Lysimachus. On the other hand, he gives a long digression on Ptolemy Lagus and Ptolemy Philadelphus, after the latter of whom one of the phylae was named, his account dealing mainly with the history of Egypt. He justifies this digression with the lengthy statement (1.6.1), that since the history of Attalus and Ptolemy (Philadelphus) was too old to be remembered, and since the historians who had been associated with these kings had been neglected even sooner, therefore he proposed to tell of their deeds, and to show how the government of the Egyptians and the Mysians and the neighboring peoples had come to their fathers. This rather absurd reason for his digression is nothing but a rhetorical variation of Herodotus 1.1: *ὥς μὲν τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γίνονται.* Such absurdities have their parallels in Pausanias (cf. 2.16.5; 3.1.9). But, if he desired to introduce Hellenistic history here, why did he not take advantage of the fact that two phylae had been named after Antigonos and his son Demetrius 306-305 B.C., which existed until 265 B.C. (cf. Thumser, Hermann's Lehrbuch, p. 775)? Biographies of these men, especially of Demetrius, would have given more of Athenian history, as he aimed to do (cf. 1.20.4; 1.25.6). A special reason appears when we combine with the digression on Ptolemy Lagus those that follow on Lysimachus, Pyrrhus and Seleucus, the latter including a brief note on Ptolemy Ceraunus. For it seems to be more than a coincidence that this whole group figures prominently in Polybius's¹ demarcation of the period when the Achaean League was revived, especially as he described (2.41.2-12) as momentous the period between the time of Alexander and the demise of these rulers (excepting Pyrrhus), which gave a convenient suggestion to fill out this period with their lives; and, actually, Pausanias lets them follow in the very order in which Polybius mentions them, even including Ptolemy Ceraunus at the end of the life of Seleucus. Moreover, Pyrrhus is equally prominent in this con-

¹In 2.41.1 Polybius says: It was the 124th Olympiad ὅτε Παρτείας ἤρξαντο συμφρονεῖν καὶ Δυναῖοι, καιροὶ δὲ καθ' οὓς Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Λάγου καὶ Αντίμαχος, ὅτι δὲ Σέλευκος καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Κεραυνὸς μετέλλαξαν τὸν βίον.

nection in Polybius, who, beside noticing him in other passages, mentions his invasion of Italy (281 B.C.) at the close of the above passage (2.41.11), and so Pausanias lets his life follow that of Lysimachus, in which he plays a prominent part, introducing the digression of nine pages as follows: *Tà μὲν οὖν Ἀνσιμάχου τοιαῦτα ἐγένετο· Ἀθηναῖοις δὲ εἰκὼν ἐστὶ καὶ Πύρρου.* This indicates that, although he had seen the statue elsewhere (cf. the Hitzig-Bluemner commentary on 1.11.1), he needed the biography here. Pausanias was happy in his selection of this interesting character and made it serve his general scheme. For, as he says, Pyrrhus was the first Greek to come in conflict with the Romans, and was encouraged by the memory of the fall of Troy and by the consciousness that he, a descendant of Achilles, was making war on the descendants of the Trojans (1.11.7 ff.).

The excursus on Pyrrhus ends with the remark that with his death terminated the ἀκμή of Epirote power, a statement which shows that he regarded these biographies in the light of general history, just as the life of Philopoemen in 7.49.1 ff. is referred to in 4.29.12 as ὁ Ἀρκαδικὸς λόγος. That the Gauls were also used by Polybius to mark the above period is shown 1.6.5, where he associates the crossing of Pyrrhus into Italy with their invasion, their defeat at Delphi, and their crossing into Asia. In 2.20.6, he associates Pyrrhus's invasion of Italy with their defeat at Delphi, to which he refers also in 2.35. Consequently Pausanias adopted the Gallic episode as a chronological point, to which he extended his general sketches of wars in 7.6.8, 8.6.3, and 10.3.4, which was made intelligible by the account given in 1.4.1 ff. How intent Pausanias was on introducing all the above mentioned history is revealed by the way he crowds it in at the beginning of the Attica, and by the way the interspersed periegetical matter serves to connect the several parts. When we glance over the whole, from the invasion of the Gauls to the death of Ptolemy Ceraunus at their hands, we seem to have a cycle beginning and ending with the Gauls as a kind of framework, an arrangement characteristic of Pausanias.

The importance of the dependence on Polybius above mentioned calls for a special notice. That, in seeking a history of the Achaean League, which was necessary for his plan, he selected Polybius's history as his source, is so natural a supposition, that, in view of the close agreements in the main part, that is, from the period beginning 200 B.C. (7.7.7), the burden of proof rests on those who would deny it. Of course his familiarity with the statues of Polybius in Arcadia, and their eulogistic inscriptions cannot be cited as evidence; on the other hand his unsatisfactory description of Polybius's history in 7.30.8-9, where he writes

συνέγραψε δὲ ὁ Πολύβιος οὗτος καὶ ἄλλα ἔργα Ῥωμαίων καὶ ὡς

Καρχηδονίους κατέστησαν ἐν πόλεμον, and proceeds to tell how Scipio profited by Polybius's advice, should not be regarded as showing an absence of first-hand knowledge. It is exactly in Pausanias's manner of reckless condensation when giving some chosen detail, here, the anecdote about Scipio, which may have been obtained, or inferred, from Polybius himself (cf. Polybius 38.22.3, ed. Büttner-Wobst). Besides, the passage continues with Polybius's rôle as mediator between the Romans and his countrymen, which was set forth in Polybius's history. A formal attempt to disprove Pausanias's direct use of Polybius in the Achaean history was made by C. Wachsmuth in *Leipziger Studien* 10.269 ff.; he found discrepancies as well as close agreements. While he admits the possibility that errors are due to Pausanias, and recognizes some of his independent work, yet he concludes that his account depends on an intermediate source. But when Wachsmuth attempts to establish characteristics of this intermediate source, we find that they are characteristics of Pausanias himself: belief in divine retribution, partisanship for the Achaeans and friendship for Athens, animosity toward the Macedonian rulers, a tendency to charge the downfall of the Achaeans to individual leaders, and fondness for parallels from Attic history. The lack of an exposition of the political situation we should better charge to the account of Pausanias than to any intermediate source. The polemic against Polybius, which Wachsmuth notices, could of course be expected of Pausanias, who, following his principle of doing justice to all the Greeks, could not sympathize, for example, with Polybius's attitude toward the Aetolians (cf. 1.4.4, where Pausanias describes their youthful vigor); his readiness to criticize his authorities is shown in the case of Herodotus, who was his *vade mecum* throughout. We must also bear in mind that Pausanias did not make excerpts mechanically, nor did he follow one source exclusively. This can be shown by contrasting the two accounts of Philopoemen in Suidas, the first taken bodily from Polybius, the second almost literally from Pausanias, with Pausanias's free handling of Plutarch's Philopoemen, with which he combined other matter. Gurlitt (*Über Pausanias*, 29) happily describes Pausanias's method as "einestheils ein Auseinanderreisen, andererseits ein musivisches Zusammenarbeiten". We may, finally, call attention to Pausanias's date (140 B.C.) for the conclusion of the war (cf. 7.16.10), which is incorrect if taken for the conclusion of hostilities (146 B.C.); but the reader can accept it for the end of the period of adjustment; and, significant for our purpose, it coincides with the end of Polybius's history (cf. Unger, *Philologus* 55 [1896], 74 ff.).

(To be concluded)

GOUCHER COLLEGE, Baltimore, Md. HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

REVIEWS

Propertius with an English Translation. By H. E. Butler (Loeb Classical Library). New York: The Macmillan Co. (1912). \$1.50.

Propertius Translated. By J. S. Phillimore. Oxford: Clarendon Press (1906). \$1.00.

Propertius has been much favored by English scholars in recent years, and the authors of these two translations are well known to students of Propertius as being among those who have had most to do with our poet. Butler is particularly known for his annotated edition, Phillimore for his text and separately published index.

Many have thought that the volumes of the Loeb series are too expensive, and this is certainly true of the Propertius. From the aesthetic standpoint it is a fairly good-looking book when we take it by itself, but by the side of the Oxford translation it looks unutterably cheap, for the latter is a really beautiful book, fully what we expect of the Clarendon Press. Yet it costs but \$1.00, while the other volume costs \$1.50. It is true that the latter contains the text also, but if the Oxford University Press were to bind in one volume Phillimore's translation and his text, its directors would certainly not charge more than \$1.50 for it, and probably less. Everything considered Butler's book should cost about 75 cents.

The introduction to Phillimore's translation consists of a gem-like little essay on the art of translation. Butler's introduction gives a brief sketch of Propertius's life, in which rather too much space is given to a discussion of the poet's name and birthplace and none at all to his literary style. There is a short bibliographical note which contains several errors. The first printed edition of Propertius is said to be Beroaldo's, of 1487. There were a half-dozen before it, beginning with 1472. To say that Palmer's edition appeared since Baehrens's is misleading, for Butler implies that Palmer used Baehrens's book. Both appeared in 1880, and neither mentions the other. Lachmann's 1829 edition is not, as Butler states, one of the "older commentaries which will on the whole be found most useful", for the simple reason that it contains no commentary at all. My copy of Plessis, *Etudes Critiques* <Butler omits this word> sur Properce, bears the date 1884 (not 1886). Sellar's well-known book on Horace and the Elegiac Poets is given a new title, *Roman Poetry under Augustus*. The titles of Teuffel's history of Roman literature and of treatises by Solbisky and Postgate are also inaccurately given. These are small matters, but they give evidence of haste, and that is why I mention them.

In comparing the translations (both of which are in prose) it is only fair to remember that Butler's work is intended merely as a help in reading the

original, while Phillimore's is more pretentious. Let us take a few favorite passages.

1.1.1-2: Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis, contactum nullis ante cupidinibus.

(B) Ah! woe is me! 'twas Cynthia first ensnared me with her eyes; till then my heart had felt no passion's fire.

(P) Cynthia was the first woman that made me the poor captive of her eyes when hitherto no touch of desire had reached me.

1.8.27: His erat! hic iurata manet!

(B) She never went! She has sworn and she remains!

(P) Here she was and here she is pledged to remain!

1.8.41-42: Sunt igitur Musae; . . . Cynthia rara mea est!

(B) The Muses then are maids of might; . . . peerless Cynthia is my own.

(P) So there are Muses; . . . Cynthia the incomparable is mine!

3.11.57-58: Septem urbs alta iugis, toto quae praesidet orbi,

femineas timuit territa Marte minas.

(B) The city high-throned on the seven hills, the queen of all the world, was terrified by a woman's might and feared her threats!

(P) The tall city on the Seven Hills, who thrones paramount over the whole world, felt the alarms of war and trembled at a woman's menace!

4.11.73-76: Nunc tibi commendo communia pignora natos:

haec cura et cineri spirat inusta meo.

Fungere maternis vicibus, pater: illa meorum

omnis erit collo turba ferenda tuo.

(B) And now to thee, Paullus, I commend our children, the common pledges of our love: this care yet lives deep-burned even into mine ashes. Father, 'tis thine to fill the mother's room; thy neck alone must bear all my children's throng.

(P) Now I commit the children to you, the gages of our union: my tender thought for them breathes yet, burned into my very ashes. You, their father, must play a mother's part by them: all that little company of mine must now be carried on your neck.

A comparison of these passages and many others seems to me to show that Phillimore's translation is as a whole more faithful and gives a far better idea of Propertius's genius, with all its peculiarities, while Butler's is much freer, more colorless and monotonous, and, at the same time, smoother and more even. Phillimore seems to have searched long for just the right word, Butler seems to have taken the right one if it was handy, and, if not, the next best. Butler

strives to avoid prosiness by a plentiful use of "thous", Phillimore avoids it without them. Yet Butler at times is better than Phillimore,—e.g. in the beautiful little elegy about the painter's conception of Cupid as a boy (2.12.13-17): "In me his darts stick fast, for me he still wears the form of a boy; but of a truth he has lost his wings, for nowhither, alas! flies he forth from my bosom, and tireless he wages war within my blood". I have also gained the impression that Butler is often more sensitive to the word order.

In an author like Propertius there are bound to be many differences of opinion on details. In these I seem to agree with Phillimore more often than with Butler. A very few comments of various sorts will be of help in judging the two books. The list could easily be enlarged. In 1.2.2 (and elsewhere) for *Coa veste*, Butler gives "Coan silk", Phillimore, "muslin of Cos". In 1.8.23, *nautas rogare citatos*, I prefer Phillimore, "to summon and question the sailors", to Butler, "to question the marines as they hurry by". In 1.8.28, *assiduas non tulit illa preces*, Phillimore is better than Butler: "She could not away with my unceasing prayers", as against "She turned a deaf ear to his persistent prayers". Phillimore's translation in 1.8.46 is obscure, to say the least: "there's a brave boast that shall not disown my grey hairs". In 1.19.19 (a difficult line) it took me some time to understand Butler's "and like love long mayst thou that livest feel" (it would be better to say 'a like love'). In 1.19.22 Butler's translation serves as well for the reading which he rejects as for the one which he adopts. In 1.21.3 Butler's text reads *quid*, but he translates it as if it were *qui* (the reading of some MSS), and likewise juggles freely with the punctuation. In 2.4.16, Phillimore's "a dozen times" is artistically, even if not mathematically, nearer Propertius's *decies* than is Butler's "three times three". In 2.12.6, *fecit et humano corde volare deum*, I feel sure that Phillimore is wrong and Butler (if I understand him) is right: "make this human-hearted god to fly" (P.); "made him flit about the hearts of men" (B.). In 2.23.14 Butler breaks away from the punctuation of his text and changes the meaning considerably. In 2.29.41 Butler repeats the translation given in his annotated edition, forgetting that he had changed his text from *custode* to *custos*. In 3.10.8 Butler's "the rock that is Niobe" is a very happy rendering of *Niobae lapis*. In 4.11.77 Butler's "kiss their tears away" contains an idea not in the original. In 4.11.82, *somnia in faciem credita saepe meam*, Phillimore's translation "the dreams which often by faith take on my features" is exquisite.

In Butler's book there is an index of names in which the information thought necessary for an understanding of the text is given. Occasionally the information is too scanty: e.g. under *Tyndaridae* it should be

stated that Castor and Pollux were a constellation.

In a word I prefer Phillimore.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

B. L. ULLMAN.

The Cults of Ostia. By Lily Ross Taylor. Bryn Mawr College Monographs; Monograph Series Volume XI. Bryn Mawr (1912). Pp. 98.

In an Introduction of twelve pages the author sets forth briefly "those facts in the history of the city which are essential to the understanding of such a study". Concerning the founding of Ostia, traditionally held to have been founded and established as a colony by Ancus Martius, it is stated (3) that "the sum of our knowledge is that before the end of the third century B.C. a legend was current to the effect that the city of Ostia was founded several centuries before, though not certainly as a colony". The presence of salt works near the Tiber's mouth does not seem a sufficient cause for the establishing of a colony there, and "it is difficult to believe that Rome for commercial reasons could have founded a colony of citizens at the Tiber's mouth long before the third century" (5). The conclusion is that a little while before 300 B.C. Rome "saw the desirability of safeguarding her commerce and her natural harbor by placing a colony of citizens at the mouth of the Tiber" (7).

Under the Republic and the Empire Ostia was the chief port for grain, but it was probably not an important place before the time of Claudius. After the construction of Trajan's Port Ostia proper became an important city, inhabited largely by the middle and lower classes. Most of the evidence for the religious history of the place comes from the second and third centuries A.D. The dissertation excludes Christianity from consideration.

Chapter I (14-45) treats of the cults of the Greek and the Roman gods, "taken up so far as possible in order of the probable date of their establishment and, when this has not been possible, in order of importance." (14); Chapter II (46-56) takes up the cult of the Emperors; Chapter III (57-93) deals with the cults of the Oriental gods. In accordance with the principle of arrangement just quoted chapter I takes up in order Vulcan, the Capitoline Triad, Castor and Pollux, Liber Pater, Venus, Fortuna, Ceres, Spes, Pater Tiberinus, Genius Coloniae Ostiensium, Hercules, Silvanus, Gods of Collegia, and Minor Cults.

The *pontifex Volcani et aedium sacrarum* was the chief religious officer of Ostia; there were also *praetores* and *aediles sacris Volcani faciundis* who may have been officials of the village which the author thinks probably existed near the site of Ostia prior to the foundation of the colony.

In honor of Castor and Pollux annual games were celebrated at Ostia by the *populus Romanus* under the

direction" of the praetor urbanus; on other occasions Roman dignitaries seem to have directed sacrifices in the temple of Castor and Pollux at Ostia. The twins were worshiped in the port city as gods who could calm the winds and the sea, which fact is in strong contrast to the attitude toward them at Rome, where they were venerated as patrons of the *equites*: Miss Taylor thinks that the cult "was introduced at Ostia from Southern Italy when Ostia first became a port of importance" (26).

At Portus the cult of Liber Pater was important in the time of Commodus and later: the god so named seems to have been really an Oriental god worshiped with orgiastic rites. To Silvanus there were numerous shrines; altars were dedicated to him often by members of the familia Caesaris. There is no evidence of a temple of Neptune at Ostia and very little information about him in any respect.

Chapter II is given to a discussion of the cult of the Emperors at Ostia, into which place contact with the Orient may have caused the early introduction of the worship. An important and forcible argument is presented in regard to the incorporation into colleges of the *seviri Augustales*. Against von Premerstein's opinion (in Ruggiero's *Dizionario*, 853 ff.) that this organization took place about 142 A.D., Miss Taylor concludes from the same evidence that "the indications are then that the *seviri* were instituted and formed into colleges between 100 and 143 <A.D.>" (54).

Of the Oriental gods Magna Mater, Isis, and Mithras are presented most prominently. Evidence from Ostia has helped much in showing the close connection of *dendrophori* and *cannophori* with the cult of Magna Mater: "From no other place are there so many inscriptions of devotees and initiates of the cult of Isis and other Egyptian gods" (68). Whether Isis was worshiped as a goddess of the sea is not certainly attested, but it is probable that she was. The evidence from Ostia bearing on the cult of Mithras is considerable and valuable, but it is not discussed extensively in this dissertation because of the sufficient treatment by Cumont.

A concluding chapter (94-98) summarizes the results of the study: the most important seems to be that after the harbor improvements had stimulated the city's growth there probably came in a large element of Oriental descent who largely supported the Oriental cults and gave them the prominence they had in Ostia in the second and third centuries A.D.

This dissertation is well wrought: many facts are brought together in convenient and desirable form and presented with clearness and care. The mode of arrangement contemplates only the presentation of information concerning the cults: with information about Christianity added there would be material for a worthy essay interpreting an important phase of

social life in a prominent city during an interesting period.

Possibly others than the reviewer will feel some hesitation about accepting the date for the founding of the colony at Ostia as only shortly before 300 B.C., for the conclusion (suggested rather than asserted) is based largely on 'arguments from silence': the arguments are that the salt works in the region do not offer sufficient reason for the establishment of a colony before that date, nor does the state of Roman commerce, nor do archaeological finds. That is pretty much in the manner of many modern critics who reject any statement in an ancient book for which they cannot see a reason. The doubting attitude is of course essential in the search for real truth, but it may easily lead one to scorn the truth itself. Now some may even find it hard to believe that Rome would not have fortified the mouth of the Tiber very early in her career, and just then her idea of a colony might have had its beginning. This statement of a possibility does not prove that the affair actually happened thus; and so we are finally driven back to our individual opinions concerning the value of the traditional element in Roman history.

TRINITY COLLEGE, Hartford.

LEROY C. BARRET.

PHILADELPHIA SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF LIBERAL STUDIES: ORGANIZATION MEETING

On Saturday, March 14, a meeting will be held at the Drexel Institute, Chestnut and 33d Streets, Philadelphia, to organize a Society "the purpose of which shall be to foster love and appreciation of the Humanities, to support in our system of education the study of the language, the literature, and the life of Greece and Rome, and to establish closer personal relations among all thus interested". So reads a circular just received.

The programme is as follows:

10 A. M.—Organization Meeting.

An address will close the morning session.

12.30-2—Luncheon and Social Intercourse.

2-4—Several Addresses on the Value of the Classics; an illustrated lecture, by Professor Walton Brooks McDaniel, on Pliny and Lake Como.

Among those who will speak on the Value of the Classics is Mr. Alba B. Johnson, President of the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

The Organization Committee invites all to attend the entire session. Those desiring to be present at the luncheon (50 cents) are requested to notify Dr. George D. Hadzsits, University of Pennsylvania.

The Organization Committee consists of Jessie E. Allen, Minnie A. Beckwith, Francis B. Brandt, F. A. Dakin, Walter Dennison, George Depue Hadzsits, Edith H. Hall, James M. Hill, Frank C. Nieweg, Stanley R. Yarnell.